



Public Intellectuals  
in South Africa

Critical Voices from the Past

Edited by  
CHRIS BROODRYK

# **Public Intellectuals in South Africa**

**Critical Voices from the Past**

**Edited by  
Chris Broodryk**



**WITS UNIVERSITY PRESS**

Published in South Africa by:  
Wits University Press  
1 Jan Smuts Avenue  
Johannesburg 2001

[www.witspress.co.za](http://www.witspress.co.za)

Compilation © Chris Broodryk 2021  
Chapters © Individual contributors 2021  
Published edition © Wits University Press 2021

First published 2021

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18772/22021076895>

978-1-77614-689-5 (Paperback)  
978-1-77614-690-1 (Hardback)  
978-1-77614-691-8 (Web PDF)  
978-1-77614-692-5 (EPUB)

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the written permission of the publisher, except in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright Act, Act 98 of 1978.

Project manager: Alison Lockhart  
Copyeditor: Alison Lockhart  
Proofreader: Sally Hines  
Indexer: Sanet le Roux  
Cover design: Hybrid Creative  
Typeset in 10 point Minion Pro

## CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
INTRODUCTION The Prismatic Nature of Public Intellectualism — <i>Chris Broodryk</i>	1
CHAPTER 1 Recalibrating the Deep History of Intellectual Thought in the KwaZulu-Natal Region — <i>Carolyn Hamilton</i>	21
CHAPTER 2 Elijah Makiwane and Early Black South African Public Intellectualism — <i>Luvuyo Mthimkhulu Dondolo</i>	44
CHAPTER 3 Black Art Criticism in <i>The Bantu World</i> during the 1930s — <i>Pfunzo Sidogi</i>	68
CHAPTER 4 In Conversation with the Nation: <i>Sowetan's</i> Maverick Editor Aggrey Klaaste — <i>Lesley Cowling</i>	86
CHAPTER 5 William Pretorius and the Public Intellectualism of the Film Critic — <i>Chris Broodryk</i>	108
CHAPTER 6 Cultural Policy and the Arts: Mewa Ramgobin and Public Dialogue — <i>Keyan G. Tomaselli</i>	129
CHAPTER 7 'Kaalgat Critique': The Public Intellectualism of Koos Roets as Afrikaans Satirist — <i>Anna-Marié Jansen van Vuuren</i>	158
CHAPTER 8 The Public Intellectualism of Artist Mandisi Sindo — <i>Katlego Chale</i>	179
CHAPTER 9 The Janus-Faced Public Intellectual: Dr Thomas Duncan Greenlees at the Institute for Imbecile Children, 1895–1907 — <i>Rory du Plessis</i>	200
CONTRIBUTORS	223
INDEX	227

CHAPTER

# 1

## Recalibrating the Deep History of Intellectual Thought in the KwaZulu-Natal Region

Carolyn Hamilton

In the literature that deals with public intellectual activity in South Africa there is a tacit understanding that one of its defining features is sustained reading and writing.<sup>1</sup> The literature shares this feature with European understandings of public intellectual activity and has not, to my knowledge, actively considered the possibility of intellectual life in settings without writing. There is further implicit agreement that 'public' in the phrase 'public intellectual' refers to the public of the 'public sphere', one of the social imaginaries of a modern democracy. It is the public called into being by the wide circulation of printed texts, the public that must read, consider and debate its options and make political choices then realised through the ballot box.<sup>2</sup>

In South Africa these assumptions about public intellectualism combine with deeply entrenched ideas about pre-colonial societies as practising timeless tribal culture and relaying oral traditions, the combination thereby precluding any exploration of pre-colonial intellectual currents and activities. These combined assumptions foreclose any investigation of how intellectual engagements in oral forms sought to persuade people and to shape political futures, both deep within the eras before colonialism and persisting into the colonial era. They obscure how such modes of debate and discussion overlapped and intersected with early literate forms of public intellectual activity.

This chapter challenges the assumptions that position thinkers of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, who expressed their ideas orally and who did not write, as atavistic relayers of oral tradition, and their literate counterparts – often their very own kin – as modern thinkers engaged in public intellectual life. Members of both seemingly distinct categories, I argue, were deeply cognisant of the immense changes of their times and both attempted to reconcile the past with the present. People in both categories were critically concerned with the navigation of change and the nature of the brokering of the past into the present that each saw as necessary to navigate that change. This involved drawing on banks of inherited knowledge, reconciling the old with the new, testing ideas and deliberating in multiple settings.

The chapter shows that deliberative activity of this kind was also a feature of life *before* colonialism. Such activity shows up in the historical record wherever significant change had to be navigated. For too long, colonialism and literacy have been allowed to constitute the effective beginning of South African history, with any earlier cognitive activity consigned to ‘tradition’. Where what went before is historicised at all, it is, at best, only ever a background chapter to the rest of history, or situated in the field of archaeology, which draws heavily on ethnographies from later eras to interpret its findings.<sup>3</sup> However, it is more than possible to begin to undertake research into political praxis in the eras before colonialism and to follow currents of political thought changing in response to changing circumstances within the pre-colonial world and across the pre-colonial/colonial divide. It is indeed possible to watch ideas travel across oral forms, from oral forms into written ones, and into ones with the oral and written inextricably entangled. To accomplish this, the pervasive distinction between literate, modern, hybrid and synthesising intellectuals and illiterate, authentic tribal informants relaying handed-down tradition requires robust interrogation.

In the rest of this chapter I attempt such an interrogation in relation to one region of southern Africa – KwaZulu-Natal – where sufficient research already exists to make it possible to pursue these issues across the pre-colonial/colonial temporal boundary. Furthermore, the era immediately before colonialism saw the rapid rise of new power in this area, the kingdom under Shaka (c. 1816–28). Shaka’s reign was short-lived and ended with a palace coup that saw a dramatic shift of power away from his closest allies, to supporters of the new incumbent, his brother, Dingane. These changes and realignments in the late independent era required political and intellectual agility, which has left discernible traces in the historical record that allow us to research how change was navigated in the late independent period and across the pre-colonial/colonial divide.

My interrogation proceeds in four steps. First, I consider the now substantial scholarly work on two prominent intellectuals, Magma Magwaza Fuze and John Langalibalele Dube. Their writings in isiZulu in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries made use of existing, and presumably long-standing, concepts – about, among other things, the nature of rule, government and nation, as well as gender roles – to discuss how things were in the past, as well as to discuss present changes and to imagine new futures. My aim is to highlight the extent to which their use of such concepts was rooted in earlier, pre-colonial currents of political thought and in inherited conceptual language that they were able to invoke, or where necessary, to refurbish to meet new needs.

Second, I consider a range of other places where such discussions were going on, also in isiZulu, about the same and related topics, but which happened orally and were written down by people other than those doing the speaking. The point of this is to register the existence of a wide and rich discursive environment in which isiZulu speakers were deliberating about the key questions of the day and, like the literate intellectuals, were exploring a variety of ways of brokering the past into the present, but doing so orally. These points are not well established in the relevant literature.

Third, I set out an argument for recognising that what these speakers offered was not relayed, formulaic oral tradition, but thoughtful disquisitions on the past. These sometimes engaged with the past in its own right, but in many instances, the past was drawn on for the intellectual resources and insights it offered for navigating contemporary changes and envisaging the future.

The final step in my argument is to show that both the written and oral political discourses, and the intellectual activity that they involved, which drew thoughtfully on the past, were not new features in the region in the late nineteenth century. There are clear indications of similar debates and forms of brokering of the past into the present in the eras before colonialism, especially in circumstances of dramatic political changes.

## **THE WRITINGS OF THE MODERN INTELLECTUALS**

There is now considerable scholarly work on early black intellectuals writing in both isiZulu and English, which offers rich insights into the multiple ways in which they navigated the enormous changes that came with colonialism.

Hlonipha Mokoena's study of Magma Fuze offers a detailed examination of the thinking and writing of one of the earliest writerly intellectuals of the region.<sup>4</sup>

From the late 1860s Fuze played an increasingly important role in the complex intersecting spheres of royal Zulu, local chiefly and colonial politics.<sup>5</sup> This entailed missions to the Zulu king, writing and printing political commentary, involvement in the trials of Zulu leaders and even joining King Dinuzulu in exile on the island of Saint Helena in 1896. While Fuze was distinctively a product of a mission education, he operated in close proximity to Zulu royalty over a long period and during his sojourn on Saint Helena he developed a cosmopolitan and pan-African consciousness. Central to his work across some 50 years was an extended engagement with questions of sovereignty, the rights, responsibilities and reach of king- and chiefship, and how their forms in previous eras would be reconfigured under colonialism.<sup>6</sup>

Diverse political and intellectual networks shaped his thought and writing, much of it expressed in isiZulu, in letters, articles in the British and local press (*Macmillan's Magazine*, *Ipepa lo Hlanga*, *Inkanyiso* and *Ilanga lase Natal*) and in his 1922 book on the history and origins of the black inhabitants of the region, *Abantu Abamnyama Lapa Bavela Ngakona*.<sup>7</sup> Mokoena argues that the picture of his thinking and writing that emerges is of a bricoleur, combining strands of thought drawn from diverse places – Christian, indigenous, Darwinian, scientific – and employing a collage of ideas and arguments, in which the history of the region loomed large.<sup>8</sup> Not only did he have much to say about the nature of the Zulu kingship and questions of sovereignty, he also tackled numerous other aspects of what has been termed 'custom', including its misappropriations under colonialism, and did so in a manner that fostered a knowledge and appreciation of the past.<sup>9</sup> As Mokoena puts it, the Christianised educated elite, or *amakholwa*, were paradoxically 'champions of modernity's enlightenment, while at the same time rejecting its colonial form'. Her argument is that the rejection took the form of a reach into the past: 'Fuze's notion of history as discourse was based on the assumption that reviving the past was the first step in the construction of Africanist knowledge.'<sup>10</sup>

By the 1890s a new generation of young literate intellectuals was making their presence felt in Natal, including John Langalibalele Dube, who was to become a leading figure. Dube is probably best known as the founding president of the African National Congress, but arguably his greatest legacy lies in the dynamism he brought into African intellectual life. He was responsible for the establishment of Ohlange, which was to become the leading school for Africans in the region, and in 1903 he began publishing the newspaper *Ilanga lase Natal*, which engaged with the pressing debates of the day about, among other things, citizenship, discrimination and government policies. Heather Hughes's biography of Dube tracks his life and work in detail.<sup>11</sup>



Dube was the author of a number of historical texts, ranging from his 1890 pamphlet published in English in the United States, 'A Talk upon My Native Land' (which included discussion of the rise of Shaka and the massacre of the Qadi people under Shaka's successor, Dingane), to what is most often referred to as the first novel in isiZulu, set in the reign of Shaka, *Insila kaShaka*, published in 1930. He was a writer of letters to prominent people, including the Zulu king, and to newspapers, such as *Inkanyiso* and the *Missionary Review of the World*. He also solicited letters and opinion for his newspaper. As editor of *Ilanga*, he would have had a significant say in what was reported in the paper – such as the trials of the rebels involved in the anti-poll tax uprising of 1906 and the subsequent trial of the then Zulu king, Dinuzulu.

More squarely still than Fuze, Dube was a thoroughly modern figure, but he too operated across the full spectrum of Natal politics. It was a field shaped by the concerns of not only the educated intelligentsia whose interests Dube promoted, but also Zulu royals, local chiefs (including *khohwa* chiefs), missionaries, governors and native administrators, large- and small-scale farmers and many others. As in Fuze's work, historical consciousness was a locus of his critique of the particular form that colonial modernity took. Like Fuze, Dube was active in navigating the enormous changes of the time, engaging with pressing questions, and brokering the past into the present. The bricolage and cobbling from multiple sources that a scholar like Mokoena sees as a distinctive feature of Fuze's 1922 book, were also present in Dube's writing. We can see him reaching in many places into the world of so-called tradition and, indeed, late in life, in 1936, he even became a founding member of the rather arcane Zulu Society, which focused on preserving Zulu heritage and customs.

Fuze and Dube had plenty of reasons to reflect on and discuss the nature of the Zulu kingship and the nature of colonial government. The early decades of the twentieth century saw the rise of a form of nationalism centred on the Zulu kingship. Such nationalist impulses affected the various ways in which thinkers and writers like Fuze and Dube interacted with the Zulu royal house and engaged with the long history of the region.<sup>12</sup> That new nationalism, and its critique of imperial and later Union rule, is central to understanding how intellectuals at this time thought about a large range of questions concerning nation, rule, government, domination, governmental and civil responsibilities, hegemony and, indeed, history itself. Support for the Zulu royal house was far from automatic for people like Fuze and Dube, whose families had previously suffered under royal Zulu rule and who had been forced to accommodate themselves to colonial Natal politics.

While much scholarly attention has focused on *kholwa* thinking and writing as being concerned with ideas of modernity and progress, close examination of Fuze's and Dube's writings reveal their depth of interest in how to think about, and value, the pre-*kholwa* past – the world described variously in the twentieth century as traditional and tribal – as well as the role and nature of the Zulu kingship and identities and connections inherited from the distant past.<sup>13</sup>

Fuze and Dube are the best known and most studied of the early generations of isiZulu-speaking literate intellectuals. Research is increasingly introducing us to other writers. Of course, these writers were also prominent speakers whose words were often recorded, with varying degrees of faithfulness, by other writers. They were continually in spoken debate and discussion in a wide variety of settings, from the most ostensibly modern to what seemed to be atavistically tribal.

### DISCOURSING ORALLY

There were numerous other situations at this time where the kinds of issues engaged with by the literate intellectuals were taken up by people who only discoursed orally. In certain instances their words were recorded in writing, with spoken isiZulu sometimes translated by either home-language isiZulu or home-language English translators and then written down by either home-language English or home-language isiZulu recorders, with all of these variations affecting how the spoken words entered the record.

These instances include, for example, documents from the 1880s, and published in 1978 in a compilation edited by Colin Webb and John Wright.<sup>14</sup> Positioned as recording the words of the Zulu king, Cetshwayo kaMpande, they were presented at the time as forms of dictation, recorded while he was a prisoner in exile, first at the Castle in Cape Town and later living in civil custody on the Cape farm, Oude Molen. The first document, described as a 'narrative ... taken down from the lips of Cetywayo, by Captain Poole ... [that] contains nothing that has not been received direct from Cetywayo', was published in English in *Macmillan's Magazine* in February 1880.<sup>15</sup> It was generated over a number of weeks while Cetshwayo was in the Castle, with translation by W.K. Longcast, who had been a British military interpreter in the Anglo-Zulu War. At the time, Cetshwayo was in the custody of Captain J. Ruscombe Poole, who appears to have been the facilitator, and possibly a co-author of a kind, of the publication. It offers a survey of the course of Zulu history and of the events leading to the war of 1879. The second document is a letter from the king to Sir Hercules Robinson, governor of the Cape Colony, written in

1881, giving King Cetshwayo's version of the war and subsequent events. It was part of a corpus of correspondence with a wide group of influential people and government in the Cape and in Britain that was generated by the king and his amanuensis, R.C.A. Samuelson, the son of a missionary, who was fluent in isiZulu and appointed as his interpreter after Longcast. The third document consisted of statements about the law and customs of the Zulu kingdom 'elicited from Cetshwayo under interrogation' by the Cape Government Commission at Oude Molen over two days in 1881 in a question and answer format. Samuelson was responsible for the translation, which was recorded by an unnamed minute-taker. The minutes were then read back to Samuelson, and then through him to Cetshwayo, and then amended. As published in 1978 the three texts comprise some 48 pages.

These texts were substantially mediated by their particular circumstances of recording as well as by the orientations, concerns and abilities of the translators and recorders.<sup>16</sup> They were also the product of what the king chose to place on record, how he engaged with the key questions of the day, the kinds of political thought he drew on, and the ways in which he brokered the past in the present. It is hardly a surprise that matters of kingship, sovereignty and the nature of rule were uppermost in his mind.

The period with which I am concerned saw many other instances of speaking in isiZulu – by Zulu royals, prominent officials, chiefs, people appearing in courts and before commissions, as well as statements made to magistrates and input rendered to experts of various stripes who were out and about collecting information. These were then set down in writing, sometimes in isiZulu and sometimes in English, by other people and many were presented as being accurate recordings. Increasingly, we know more and more about the circumstances under which these various records that purport to render spoken speech came into being.

Spoken discussions that referenced the past that were never recorded, but went on in daily life, would have happened in situations too countless to list, but a sense of the range and extent of this may be productive to keep in mind. The long-ago past would have been drawn on not only in addressing ancestors at grave sites, significant ritual settings and in fireside storytelling. This was time of rapid urbanisation and it would also have been referenced in libations in the new beerhalls and in conversations at trade union and church meetings in the growing town of Durban. Many undocumented discussions of political import would have taken place in chiefly courts and meetings of many kinds, as well as on journeys to colonial courts, in commentary on contested outcomes of justice processes, and in response to proclamations and changes in governmental policy. Some of these discussions would have taken place under circumstances that the participants considered, in one way

or another, significant – that is, more than mere conversation. When we begin to think like this about all the places that political issues were being discussed, carefully picked over and debated, where past ways of doing things were being reviewed and change was being interrogated, we begin to grasp something of the extent of the richly discursive environment in which isiZulu speakers were participating in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

One of the places where this was happening was in the many conversations that a range of people were having, mostly in isiZulu, with the colonial official James Stuart, the recorded notes of which are widely described as a vast body of recorded oral tradition.

### ORAL TRADITION AND THE STATING OF THEIR OWN VIEWS

Between 1897 and 1921 the Natal administrator James Stuart held discussions with some 200 people he regarded as well informed on what he thought of as Zulu history and custom. He was especially interested in the nature of rule in the time of Shaka, which he considered a useful model for colonial governance, and he steered many of the conversations onto this subject.<sup>17</sup> Stuart was a fluent isiZulu speaker and he took detailed notes of the conversations. In certain instances, he was concerned to record the particular narrative flow and the exact words in isiZulu of his interlocutors. Indeed, his corpus of notes is considered to be one of the richest bodies of what is often described as 'oral tradition' in southern Africa. As oral traditions recorded from what are seen by scholars as authentic tribal informants, these accounts are typically treated as narratives handed down across generations, more or less faithfully.<sup>18</sup>

However, close reading of the recorded texts and research into the contexts, lives and networks of these informants, of the kind that has been done by scholars who have worked on Fuze and Dube, throws light on their intellectual processes, political concerns and their praxis in a manner that invites radical reassessment of them as 'informants' and relayers of oral tradition. In this chapter I discuss in detail one of Stuart's interlocutors, Ndlovu kaThimuni, in order to demonstrate this point.<sup>19</sup>

In two sessions across some 11 days in 1902 and 1903 Stuart held sustained discussions with Ndlovu kaThimuni. Ndlovu was a prominent figure in Natal chiefly politics.<sup>20</sup> He was a grandson of Mudli kaNkwelo kaNdaba, who had been actively involved in the accession of his kinsman, Shaka, to the Zulu chieftaincy and had later been killed by Shaka.<sup>21</sup> According to Ndlovu, his father, Thimuni, had been forced by Shaka's assassin and successor, King Dingane, to leave the Zulu country and settle to the south in what was to become the colony of Natal.<sup>22</sup> Relations with

the main Zulu royal house were tense in this period. Over the ensuing decades boundary disputes with neighbouring chiefs and white land encroachments forced Thimuni and his followers into an ever-smaller area, subjecting them to a colonial magistrate's authority and increasingly onerous forms of colonial taxation and labour demands. By the time Ndlovu met with Stuart, his family had some 50 years of experience in colonial Natal politics.<sup>23</sup>

Stuart first met with Ndlovu on Friday, 7 November 1902, probably at Stuart's place of work as assistant magistrate in Durban.<sup>24</sup> Stuart recorded that Ndlovu 'called on me today with another, being referred to me by my old friend, Mkando'.<sup>25</sup> The formulation 'called on me', with its tones of Victorian social nicety, indicates that the connection was initiated by Ndlovu, without prior arrangement but with a certain formality. In what Stuart indicates was a conversation of about 45 minutes, the men touched on aspects of the reigns of Shaka, Dingane and Mpande, and a host of other things. They then arranged to meet the next day at Stuart's home. Ndlovu accordingly arrived with a small entourage and stayed the night. Stuart's induna, Ndukwana kaMbengwana, was present.<sup>26</sup> Significantly, the Saturday conversation was not so much about the past as the present. It was dominated by a three-and-a-half-hour conversation 'on the native question in its general aspect'.<sup>27</sup> In the course of the conversation, Ndukwana intervened often, registering and discussing multiple contemporary problems, as did Ndlovu, whom Stuart recorded as noting:

Everyone would hail with delight the holding of native public meetings in Pietermaritzburg from time to time. That is what is truly needed ... he was of the opinion the last generation had failed in not educating native children. He considers that *kolwas* and others are corrupted by new-comers from England and elsewhere who know nothing of the native. It is not mere education that alienates the young men etc.<sup>28</sup>

A reader familiar with the wider corpus of Stuart papers, and with the particular policies that Stuart was advocating at this time for native administration in Natal, can immediately confirm what the first-time reader probably senses, that this statement is as much a reflection of Stuart's thinking as anything that Ndlovu had to say. Stuart was an advocate of regular consultations and is many times on record commenting on the general lack of knowledge on native customs relevant to indigenous governance among the new generation of native administrators.

What Ndlovu and the men with him actually had to say on that Saturday afternoon cannot be recovered from these notes, at least not at face value, since they are the product of what Stuart chose to note down. What the notes do attest to upfront

is that both parties, Stuart and Ndukwana, and their visitors, were deeply interested in and concerned about contemporary issues, and were choosing to meet and to discuss them. They were also deliberating, with ideas, opinions and, as the notes make clear, historical references, going backwards and forwards.

On the Sunday, Ndlovu began by saying that he had reflected on Stuart's remarks of the previous day about Africans being allowed their own parliament and managing their own affairs according to their own laws and customs. Stuart captured his words thus:

He said the present state of affairs has turned them into mice ... if such a policy of allowing them to manage their own affairs were conceded, the people would be able to bear any burden, however great it might be, seeing they would then have a full knowledge of what they were doing ... Men should not continue to be *izigubu* (dummies), and not be allowed to *state their own views* (*pendula*). Natives have become *izamuku* (mutes); we cannot make ourselves heard.<sup>29</sup>

Ndlovu had no hesitancy in asserting his criticisms: '*Umteto u isiqwaga*', which Stuart glossed in his notes as 'the law is a tyrant (no respecter of persons)'. The comments that follow, in a mix of English and isiZulu in Stuart's notes, probably reflect Ndlovu's sentiments: 'A law is passed by the European and it is forcibly applied straight away. There ought to be councils among the natives for no man can *make laws* alone.'<sup>30</sup> After close perusal of the many pages of notes of the conversations in which Ndlovu and his companions were involved, it is hard to imagine that any of the participants in the conversation could have been in doubt that the forays into the past were undertaken in order to explore their significance for contemporary governance.

When he was again on a visit to Durban, Ndlovu chose to resume the conversation with Stuart, this time on New Year's Day of 1903.<sup>31</sup> Stuart, Ndukwana and Ndlovu met again on 11 January, this time with Ndlovu's brother Mhuyi kaThimuni present, and again in March.

The first point I wish to draw attention to is that these conversations were not seen by the participating parties as recording sessions of established historical narratives (although as I shall show, there were quite separate occasions when the recording of narratives was the purpose.) While these conversations sometimes involved digressions and moments of engaging with the past with no obvious purpose, they were, for the most part, discussion occasions in their own right.<sup>32</sup> The engagements referenced the past in numerous ways, illuminating points, supporting lines of

thought and critically considering alternatives in the present and for the future. The deliberate way in which Ndlovu approached Stuart and pursued the discussion across multiple encounters, along with chosen associates, is indicative of his praxis in entering into a dialogic space and seeking thereby to engage with and act upon the changing world in which he was operating, a praxis that was later to take a still more dramatic turn with his involvement in the 1906 rebellion.

My second point is that even when Ndlovu offered lengthy accounts of events in the past, he did not do so simply as a relay of an established, stable story or tradition, but actively crafted his own account, drawing on multiple sources to establish the points he wished to make. Ndlovu indicated that one of his sources of information was his father, Thimuni kaMudli.<sup>33</sup> On the face of it, it would seem that Ndlovu as the son of Thimuni, who was himself the son of Mudli, was relaying what his grandfather told his father, who then told him. But Stuart also interviewed a brother of Ndlovu's, Mhuyi kaThimuni. The accounts offered by the brothers differ significantly, with Ndlovu offering far greater historical detail, and with the two accounts diverging on important issues. It is possible that Mhuyi, who had much less contact with his father than Ndlovu did, heard less, was less interested in the past and failed to remember family history or – and none of these points are mutually exclusive – that Ndlovu was making use of a larger variety of historical resources.

Comparison of the accounts offered by Ndlovu and Mhuyi reveals that they diverged to a degree and in a form that went beyond what might be attributed to lack of interest, poor memory or faulty transmission in a chain of testimony. The essential difference concerned the critical question of Shaka's status as son of Senzangakhona. Ndlovu stated that Shaka was illegitimate. Mhuyi said he was not and each account contained narrative details supporting its claim. One crucial differentiating factor was that Ndlovu noted to Stuart that he also owed much of his knowledge of Shaka to Sipika, a man of Senzangakhona's Mnkangala *ibutho*, who was actively involved in the events leading up to death of Senzangakhona and the accession of Shaka.<sup>34</sup> All this suggests strongly that Ndlovu was not only more exposed than Mhuyi to what Thimuni had to say, but that he also actively took up details provided by at least one other person than his father, namely, Sipika, braiding the accounts together for himself.

If we now turn to a consideration of what we know about Thimuni kaMudli, we discover that he too did not simply participate in a generational relay of tradition. To establish this point, we must diverge for a moment from our discussion of Ndlovu and Thimuni, to introduce someone in Ndlovu's network. In his discussions with Stuart and Ndukwana, Ndlovu offered to send to them Jantshi kaNongila, whom he

recommended for his skills as a praise poet.<sup>35</sup> Within a month Jantshi was ensconced at Stuart's home for a set of conversations spread over about ten days. The notes indicate that Ndukwana participated in these conversations too and that again an active exchange of information ensued. The notes make it clear that Ndukwana and Jantshi argued over a variety of historical details.<sup>36</sup>

I have elsewhere discussed at length how Jantshi garnered the information he drew on in his discussions with Stuart and Ndukwana, concluding that he relied heavily on what his father, Nongila, an intelligence specialist under successive Zulu kings and an expert in marshalling information, told him. Jantshi claimed Ndlovu's father, Thimuni, also derived his knowledge of history from Nongila and, indeed, Jantshi's and Ndlovu's accounts overlap in significant ways.<sup>37</sup> The point of this digression into what Jantshi had to say is that it brings into view the networks of information, discussion flows and processes of the accrual of information that not only Ndlovu and Jantshi were engaged in, but also those of their fathers Nongila and Thimuni. Significantly, in Nongila and Thimuni's time, politics was scarcely less turbulent than in 1902-03. Nongila and Thimuni were themselves navigating rapid political change. They both fled the Zulu kingdom into what became the colony of Natal, with all the adjustments that entailed.<sup>38</sup> Through all of this, histories mattered politically and were assiduously reconsidered and revised. In these earlier eras history was as much a part of political discourse as it was revealed to be when Ndlovu, his followers, Ndukwana and Stuart sat down together.

What emerges from this line of investigation is a picture of a complex series of syntheses across time, drawn on thoughtfully by Ndlovu. We can track the processes of Ndlovu's take-up of ideas, including historical information. Here my substantive point is that when we give Ndlovu's accounts as much attention as we give those of writers like Fuze or Dube, we find similar processes of historical crafting, the bringing together of information and arguments from various sources, and the signs of animated intellectual activity.

In the case of Fuze, the intellectual biographer is on relatively familiar research ground, even if she must, as Mokoena does, do much that is innovative to overturn racialised habits of thinking about who is and who is not an intellectual, to enable us to hear what Fuze has to say, as well as to track little-known networks, foreground the contents of vernacular accounts, explore the nature of their forms and the manners of their mediation. Any attempt to track the intellectual biography of someone like Ndlovu must similarly overturn habits of thinking that position him as a tribal informant, reconstruct the circumstances of the making of records concerning him, as well as of the resources that he drew on, read for the signs of his



thinking embedded in the notes of others, and foreground his words and concepts wherever they can be found in the record.

But the matter does not rest there, as there is another habit of thinking that requires critical review and that is the idea that the literate intellectuals were political thinkers with a wide range of connections while the so-called informants were insular tribesmen. The factors and experiences that shaped Ndlovu's thinking speak to the scope and range of the networks of ideas that Ndlovu was involved with. In 1903 when Ndlovu was talking to Stuart, these were far from self-contained Natal networks of rural tribal informants. For one thing, Ndlovu was well travelled. Not only had he traversed the region between what is today Maputo and the Kimberley diamond fields, but like Fuze, he was to end up on Saint Helena.<sup>39</sup> This was a result of the central role he played in the 1906 rebellion against the poll tax, the so-called Bambatha Rebellion. This turned him into a central figure in Natal politics. Ndlovu featured prominently in the highly publicised trial that followed the rebellion. The court record reveals much about Ndlovu's abilities to operate publicly in this showcase trial and to present his version of the events of the uprising in the face of a prosecution bent on depicting him as bloodthirsty, barbaric and devious. Ndlovu emerged as a 'canny leader of undoubted ability'.<sup>40</sup> He was at the centre of a complex network of communication and strategising among the rebels, in contact with the Zulu royal house prior to the trial, and afterwards with an even wider network of people in strategising the post-rebellion situation. These networks included many of the writerly intellectuals I have been referring to.

The trial was of pressing concern for people like Fuze and Dube, who were themselves advising King Dinuzulu at the time. It was actively discussed in the black and white press. It is hard to imagine that prominent figures like Dube and Ndlovu, whose home bases were in close proximity to each other, did not actually know each other and never talked in person. If they did not, they most certainly knew a great deal about each other and the kind of thinking and activity that the other was engaged in. Their networks were far from sealed off from each other. Both were involved in local chiefly matters, Ndlovu as a chief himself and Dube in the chiefly politics of the Qadi, with which the Dube family was historically connected.<sup>41</sup> From the time of King Dinuzulu's return from exile in 1898, both Ndlovu and Dube were involved with the Zulu royal house. At the time of the trial, and again at the time of Ndlovu's own return from exile that was the result of the 1906 trial, there can be no doubt that *both* Ndlovu and Dube were thinking deeply about the order of things in the past and how it was changing. And, in the course of these reflections, both engaged in consideration of the past, notably the reign of Shaka.

The lives of the supposedly authentic tribal informants were thus intertwined with those of their *kholwa* neighbours and kin – both immediate and distant – in Natal, as well as with a variety of other literate political allies. There is much more evidence that can be elucidated about these parties' shared concerns about the matters of nation, rule, government, domination, governmental and civil responsibilities and hegemony, and their thinking about the significance of what those things were like in the past and in the present. These were, after all, the pressing questions of the day, for the apparently tribal informants as much as the *kholwa* literates.

Stuart again interviewed Ndlovu in 1919 across three days, this time clearly making a specific effort to record his spoken words verbatim in isiZulu. It seems that Stuart's purpose on this occasion was to get Ndlovu to cover in detail many of the stories about Shaka first raised under very different circumstances in 1902 and 1903. The reason he took down Ndlovu's words with such precision in 1919 was because he planned to use them in an isiZulu-language school reader.<sup>42</sup> The discussion of contemporary political developments that characterised the earlier discussions is nowhere present in this later set of notes. By 1919 both Stuart and Ndlovu were all too aware that the kinds of consultative processes that in 1902–03 they had agreed were desirable were not to be.

Ndlovu kaThimuni, Mhuyi kaThimuni, Jantshi kaNongila, Ndukwana kaMbengwana and many others were involved in the special efforts (and sometimes chance encounters) that resulted in them talking to Stuart in isiZulu, under circumstances very much of Stuart's making but, as we are able to see in certain instances, in circumstances that involved dynamics that exceeded Stuart's agendas.<sup>43</sup> Of course, many other people in the region were also both talking and writing in isiZulu on a wide range of topics, including the long past.

## THINKING THE PAST IN THE PRESENT WITH AN EYE TO THE FUTURE

In all sorts of ways the concerns of a significant component of the writings by the literate intellectuals overlapped with the focuses of the Stuart notes, shaped as the notes were by the congruence of interest of Stuart and many of his interlocutors in indigenous governance, practices of rule and the reign of Shaka. They also overlapped with other subjects that feature more incidentally in the Stuart corpus.

We can see that the writers were interested not merely in the modern present – and the agenda of progress and change – but were actively assessing the meaning and possibilities of the past in their present. There can be no doubt that the oral

discourers too were profoundly aware of the need to navigate a changing world. The Stuart notes abound in explicit statements on this. Unlike the interest the Stuart notes have attracted for the detail that they offer on the reigns of Shaka and Dingane, they have not been much explored for what they have to say about political thought, discursive activity and the navigation of change, though where they have, much is revealed.<sup>44</sup>

How researchers read the texts of the writerly intellectuals has often been a result of notions about the writerly intellectuals as acculturated and having imbibed questionable ideas of European thinkers about topics like Bantu migrations and racial origins.<sup>45</sup> These ideas are then regarded as having been cobbled together with fragments of oral traditions only poorly known because of *khohwa* distance from tribal situations and history. The results are judged to be either 'imperfect historical sources' with 'faults of style and errors of fact', such as Fuze's *Abantu Abamnyama*, or positioned as literary works of fiction, like Dube's *Insila kaShaka*.<sup>46</sup> Many of the written works on historical subjects are read as Zulu, or African, nationalist tracts of comparatively little historical substance.

Narrators like Stuart's interlocutors are regarded as not doing synthesising intellectual work in order to make sense of the world they live in, but as relaying a more or less uncontaminated oral tradition from bygone years. This impression persists in the face of a growing body of work that reveals them to be as adept in mobilising history to resource their thinking and to navigate change at the time of recording as their literate counterparts. We can see much the same kind of bricolage and cobbling that Mokoena sees in Fuze's writing, and that characterises the writing of Dube, at work in the recorded words of someone like Ndlovu kaThimuni, who has long been regarded as offering pure and authentic oral tradition. More importantly, a growing body of research indicates that historical discourse was continually being reworked in the generations that preceded Stuart's interlocutors to cope with complex and rapidly changing political circumstances.

What these accounts, written and oral, share is an understanding and treatment of history as something to be deliberated over, as manifestly a subject of debate. Much overt discussion of this kind took place in the pages of Dube's newspaper, *Ilanga*. Mokoena shows us that debate was actively solicited by Fuze when he wrote columns and letters for newspapers, and when he responded to his argumentative readers.<sup>47</sup> Much spoken word that was recorded as historical evidence was delivered in situations where conflicts of interpretation were understood by the participants as the very condition of the offering of historical knowledge, nowhere more so than in the contested settings of courtrooms and before commissions. And, as I have shown from this brief engagement with the encounters that resulted in the

corpus of notes made by Stuart recording the words of Ndlovu kaThimuni, history as contested, debated and debatable, and subject to assessment and revision, was present in both the content and form of the discussions at Stuart's home in Durban.

\* \* \*

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries intellectual activity was not the preserve of literates. People like Ndlovu kaThimuni were just as engaged in navigating thoughtfully the changes of the time as were the writerly intellectuals. Like them, Ndlovu drew on the past to address the concerns of the present. Like them, he braided together strands of information in ways that helped in making sense of the past and that enabled thinking about the future. He paid attention to the ideas of others, exerting his critical faculties at every turn, mobilising networks and drawing on banks of knowledge to make important decisions and defend disputed actions. He was concerned to place the past on record and was active in brokering the past into the present. These were all things that the literate intellectuals of his time were doing. There are abundant signs in Ndlovu's accounts and in his own practice that 'the oral past', as Mokoena terms it, was full of resources and strategies for how to navigate change.

In focusing on the intellectual activity of Ndlovu, this chapter draws attention to currents of political thought with roots in the eras before colonialism. These currents were not timeless products, but thought in motion in response to political change. It also highlights another kind of legacy about being a public figure and speaking out on the questions of the day and not being, as Ndlovu put it, a 'nobody' or 'izamuka (mutes)'. Ndlovu clearly appreciated the value of debate and advocated for gatherings for public discussion and debate. He chose to engage with and confront colonial thinking.

A further implication of the arguments made in this chapter concerns the nature of the archive that these writings and recorded notes collectively make up. Mokoena makes the point that Fuze and the readers of his columns regularly argued about the meaning of isiZulu words and sought to develop both a linguistically correct secular vocabulary and a religious one.<sup>48</sup> Discussions about the meanings of words are also to be found throughout the conversations recorded by Stuart. In all the texts concerned – the writings by Fuze and Dube, and their many respondents and fellow literate intellectuals, and in the hundreds of pages of Stuart notes, in Cetshwayo's various statements, and in many instances that I have not had the space here to mention – words were set up to do work in sentences. The kinds of work they did was historically contingent but, in all cases, a more or less shared inherited vocabulary

was being used by all of these writers and speakers to navigate change, to say things about the past, the present and the future. How the words did their work was not merely contingent, but also informed by legacies of thought about the nature of rule and power and many other things – indeed, the very order of things. There is a vast amount of recorded text in isiZulu that says these things, coming from multiple positions, generated under a wide variety of circumstances. The archive that this chapter delineates is a register of the navigation of change. The inherited concepts that were available in the period when the archive was laid down were not, of course, frozen time travellers into the period. They were concepts with long histories of being put to work in past discourses, with changing inflections across time. Collectively, they constitute a complex and colossal archive awaiting exploration.

The burden of my argument here is that inherited concepts were in motion in the thinking of Ndlovu as much as they were in that of Fuze and Dube, and furthermore they were also in motion in the thinking and articulations, in turn, of Thimuni kaMudli, something we glimpse through what Ndlovu, Mhuyi and Jantshi have to say about Thimuni and his knowledge of the past. We can only imagine what the case regarding concepts in motion would have been for Thimuni's father, Mudli, who oversaw the accession of Shaka within the small Zulu chiefdom and who participated in the massive changes in the political landscape that accompanied the rapid expansion of the Zulu king's control over the wider KwaZulu-Natal region.

Researchers who might be interested in what nation, rule, government, domination, governmental and civil responsibilities and hegemony might have meant and how they might have operated in Shakan or earlier times, not to mention kingship, the role of women, the nature of expertise and a million other questions, have access to a vast array of texts produced under a variety of circumstances at the end of the nineteenth century and in the early decades of the twentieth century, all concerned with these questions, with what they meant in the past, what they meant at the time, and what they might mean in the future, with much of all this expressed in isiZulu. Some texts may well offer us important details about historical events, central places and important figures. But, arguably just as significantly, the texts offer us a well-populated field of conceptual usage at a particular time, by a large range of people, in a variety of formats and mediums, with all kinds of registers of communication, modes of address, pressures and allures of cultural translation and brokerage, and conventions of rendering into text.

Just as I have argued that the written texts are as much of an archive as the recorded oral ones, so too have I sought to show that the recorded oral texts are likewise evidence of thoughtful syntheses and acts of brokerage. In the face of this extended archive it is no longer possible, if it ever was, to rely on the ethnographies

of the same period for insight into the conceptual world of that time of isiZulu speakers, and to assume people in previous eras had much the same 'world view'. Scholars can no longer valorise the brokerage and syntheses of ethnographers at the expense of paying attention to the brokerage and syntheses that we can see in these texts. To make these points is not to wish simply to supplant the ethnographic texts with these ones. Rather, it is to recognise that each of these kinds of text – ethnographic as much as the literary or recorded oral – is a particular production worth investigating *as a production*.

History produced by black intellectuals, typically operating in urban settings, was consigned out of the field of historiography as literature and politics, while the oral productions of history by black thinkers, typically in rural settings, were positioned as sources. This double manoeuvre not only denied historical authority to both of these forms of history production, but also favoured the narratives of the rural informant as historically more authentic than the writings of the urban intellectual, thereby lancing both forms of historical production of their discursive potency. This chapter offers a historical perspective on the pressures on academics today to grapple with the limits of the existing disciplines and the weight of what Bhekizizwe Peterson has termed the 'Black Humanities', developed over the last century by intellectuals and thinkers outside those disciplines.

#### NOTES

This chapter is based on an online curation 'Umlando, Ukuqamba and the Stating of Their Own Views', originally prepared for the Five Hundred Year Archive project (<https://fha.org/>). I am grateful to participants in the Archive & Public Culture Research Development workshop for their helpful comments on an early version.

- <sup>1</sup> Peter Vale, Lawrence Hamilton and Estelle Prinsloo, eds, *Intellectual Traditions in South Africa: Ideas, Individuals and Institutions* (Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2014); Mcebisi Ndletyana, ed., *African Intellectuals in 19th and Early 20th Century South Africa* (Cape Town: HSRC Press, 2008); William Gumede and Leslie Dikeni, eds, *The Poverty of Ideas: South African Democracy and the Retreat of Intellectuals* (Johannesburg: Jacana Media, 2009); Jane Poyner, ed., *J.M. Coetzee and the Idea of the Public Intellectual* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2006). See also the two-part symposium on 'Exceeding Public Spheres', *Social Dynamics* 35, no. 2 (2009) and 36, no. 1 (2010), produced under the auspices of the Constitution of Public Intellectual Life Project, Wits University.
- <sup>2</sup> Carolyn Hamilton and Lesley Cowling, 'Rethinking Public Engagement', in *Babel Unbound: Rage, Reason and Rethinking Public Life*, ed. Lesley Cowling and Carolyn Hamilton (Johannesburg: Wits University Press, 2020), 21–39.
- <sup>3</sup> Historical studies are not entirely absent, but they are very much the minority.
- <sup>4</sup> Hlonipha Mokoena, *Magema Fuze: The Making of a Kholwa Intellectual* (Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2011). See also Vukile Khumalo, 'The Class of 1856

- and the Politics of Cultural Production(s) in the Emergence of Ekukhanyeni, 1855–1910, in *The Eye of the Storm: Bishop John William Colenso and the Crisis of Biblical Inspiration*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper (Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Publications, 2003), 207–241.
- <sup>5</sup> Jeff Guy, *The View across the River: Harriette Colenso and the Zulu Struggle against Imperialism* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2002), 43.
- <sup>6</sup> In this chapter I follow the English language convention that uses a title and then the name proper (typically, 'Queen Elizabeth' and 'Elizabeth'), which formally implies a singularity that requires no further qualification – hence, 'King Cetshwayo' and 'Cetshwayo'. Of course, the English term 'king' imposes on indigenous forms of rulership the concepts and thinking of Europe and may well efface or obscure distinctive features of indigenous rulership. The matter of the correct title for King Shaka's father, Senzangkhona, presents further difficulties, as in his lifetime he was subject to the overlordship of Dingiswayo, king of the Mthethwa. These are all matters for critical reflection in their own right.
- <sup>7</sup> Magema Fuze, *Abantu Abamnyama Lapa Bavela Ngakona* (Pietermaritzburg: City Printing Works, 1922).
- <sup>8</sup> Mokoena, Fuze, 154, 160, 164.
- <sup>9</sup> Mokoena, Fuze, 166–167.
- <sup>10</sup> Mokoena, Fuze, 160.
- <sup>11</sup> Heather Hughes, *The First President: A Life of John Dube* (Johannesburg: Jacana Media, 2011).
- <sup>12</sup> Shula Marks, 'The Ambiguities of Dependence: John L. Dube of Natal', *Journal of Southern African Studies* 1, no. 2 (1975): 162–180; Nicholas Cope, 'The Zulu Petit Bourgeoisie and Zulu Nationalism in the 1920s: Origins of Inkatha', *Journal of Southern African Studies* 16, no. 3 (September 1990): 431–451; Paul la Hausse de Lalouvière, *Restless Identities: Signatures of Nationalism, Zulu Ethnicity and History in the Lives of Petros Lamula (c.1881–1948) and Lymon Maling (1889–c.1936)* (Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 2000); Benedict Carton, John Laband and Jabulani Sithole, eds, *Zulu Identities: Being Zulu, Past and Present* (Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2009).
- <sup>13</sup> Mokoena notes that the terms in which the *amakhohwa* expressed their political aspirations, whether in public arenas or published books, were almost always borrowed from the political vocabulary of the colonial order. It seems to me that her point has obvious application to their writings in English. I am less certain about how this happened in their Zulu texts. See Mokoena, Fuze, 21.
- <sup>14</sup> This was not the first recording of King Cetshwayo's words. Many documents claimed to report on his speech, including Fuze's published account of his 1877 visit to Cetshwayo, which included details of conversations he had with the Zulu king. Magema Fuze, 'A Visit to King Ketswayo', *MacMillan's Magazine* (March 1878): 421–432.
- <sup>15</sup> Colin de B. Webb and John B. Wright, eds, *A Zulu King Speaks: Statements Made by Cetshwayo kaMpande on the History and Customs of His People* (Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 1978), 1.
- <sup>16</sup> Webb and Wright mention the processes involved in transforming the king's statements into written documents, noting that many 'errors' crept in, and recording their editorial decision to reproduce the documents with any defects uncorrected. Webb and Wright, *A Zulu King Speaks*, xxxi.
- <sup>17</sup> Carolyn Hamilton, *Terrific Majesty: The Powers of Shaka and the Limits of Historical Invention* (Cape Town: David Philip, 1998), Chapter 4.

- <sup>18</sup> For a recent instance pertinent to this region, see Elizabeth A. Eldredge, *The Creation of the Zulu Kingdom, 1815–1828: War, Shaka, and the Consolidation of Power* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 13, 21, 23.
- <sup>19</sup> In his notes Stuart used a form of the orthography of the day in rendering Ndlovu's name as 'Ndhlovu'. As I have no indication of how Ndlovu would have elected to render his name during his life, I follow the convention of a default to modern orthography for the name of the person, rather than defaulting to the colonial recorder's choice. However, when I refer to the 'title' of the 1986 published text of the Ndlovu conversation, I reproduce without alteration the published title's elected orthography: 'Ndhlovu ka Timuni'.
- <sup>20</sup> In the period discussed in this chapter, literate black intellectuals were adopting the convention of a first name and surname. Where there is evidence of such choices, I have followed standard practice of giving full names on first mention in full (as in 'Magama Magwaza Fuze'), thereafter referring to these authors by their surnames (as in 'Fuze'). I have refrained from imposing this convention on the recordings of the statements of people who did not in their lifetimes make use of a surname. Instead, I employ the formal 'Ndlovu ka l'himuni' (indicating that Ndlovu was a son of Thimuni's) on first mention and use 'Ndlovu' thereafter. However, this feels inappropriately familiar, even casual. I am not satisfied that this form of naming establishes, authorially, the sense of equivalence between the written and oral disquisitions that I am positing. The use of *izithakazelo*, or address names, would confer a status that offers a formality similar to the use of the surname for authors in English. However, it proves confusing when the account features numerous people with the same *izithakazelo*.
- <sup>21</sup> Stuart noted that Ndukwana kaMbengwana, also present when the conversation happened, described Ndlovu's branch of the royal family as the left-hand or *ikohlo*, side of the royal house, a status that would exclude them from the royal succession. 'Ndhlovu ka Timuni', in Colin de B. Webb and John B. Wright, eds, *The James Stuart Archive of Recorded Oral Evidence Relating to the History of the Zulu and Neighbouring Peoples, Volume 3* (Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press; Durban: Killie Campbell Africana Library, 1982), 198. In the discussion that follows I mostly reference the published account, edited by Webb and Wright. However, I worked with copies of the original handwritten text in hand, constantly consulting the latter to grasp as fully as possible how the original notes have been altered through the editing and publication process. I paid close attention also to how text recorded in isiZulu was translated by the editors.
- <sup>22</sup> Ndlovu noted that his father was forced to leave the Zulu kingdom during the reign of King Dingane and for a while lived practically independently of the Zulu royal house in Natal, though he did not dare to hold royal rituals for fear of reprisal from the Zulu royal house ('Ndhlovu ka Timuni', Webb and Wright, *James Stuart Archive* 3, 207). However, Thembinkosi Madlala references a 1973 file from the Chief Minister's Office, Ulundi (N1113(447)), to support a claim that Thimuni crossed into Natal later, after the Battle of Ndongakusuka in 1856, having supported the unsuccessful Mbuyazi in his attempt to succeed King Mpande (himself the successor to Dingane). Thembinkosi N. Madlala, 'The Role of Prince Thimuni kaMudli kaJama in Zulu History with Special Reference to the Activities of his Sons, Ndlovu and Chakijana, and their Descendants, 1842–1980' (Master's thesis, University of Zululand, 1997), 1–2.
- <sup>23</sup> Madlala, 'The Role of Prince Thimuni kaMudli kaJama', Chapter 3.



- <sup>24</sup> I take it that the first encounter was at Stuart's workplace because Stuart refers in his notes to the fact that his induna, Ndukwana kaMbengwana, was not present at this first meeting, noting that the latter was obliged to remain at home as Stuart was in the process of moving house, an activity in which Ndukwana, as Stuart's induna, would have played an important role. 'Ndhlovu ka Timuni', Webb and Wright, *James Stuart Archive 3*, 198.
- <sup>25</sup> The reference is probably to Mkando kaDhlova, a man of the Luthuli clan, also from the Maphumulo district, whom Stuart met with, and recorded the notes of the conversation, across some 26 days in July and August 1902. Webb and Wright, *James Stuart Archive 3*, 145–189.
- <sup>26</sup> 'Ndhlovu ka Timuni', Webb and Wright, *James Stuart Archive 3*, 199–200, 205. 'Induna' is from isiZulu: singular noun: *induna*, pl. *izinduna*, a term used for an appointed official with authority. For a detailed account of who Ndukwana was and his relationship with Stuart, see John B. Wright, 'Ndukwana kaMbengwana as an Interlocutor on the History of the Zulu Kingdom, 1897–1903', *History in Africa* 38 (2011): 343–368.
- <sup>27</sup> 'Ndhlovu ka Timuni', Webb and Wright, *James Stuart Archive 3*, 200.
- <sup>28</sup> 'Ndhlovu ka Timuni', Webb and Wright, *James Stuart Archive 3*, 201. Italics in this and other quoted text from the published version of the conversations indicates that the word was rendered in isiZulu in the original handwritten notes of the conversation.
- <sup>29</sup> 'Ndhlovu ka Timuni', Webb and Wright, *James Stuart Archive 3*, 207. The phrase 'state their own views' is the editors' translation of '*pendula*'). The translation of *izigubu* and *izamuka* were Stuart's.
- <sup>30</sup> 'Ndhlovu ka Timuni', Webb and Wright, *James Stuart Archive 3*, 207.
- <sup>31</sup> 'Ndhlovu ka Timuni', Webb and Wright, *James Stuart Archive 3*, 212.
- <sup>32</sup> 'Ndhlovu ka Timuni', Webb and Wright, *James Stuart Archive 3*, 200 and 213. See also 206.
- <sup>33</sup> 'Ndhlovu ka Timuni', Webb and Wright, *James Stuart Archive 3*, 200. Also see Stuart's comments about how Ndukwana developed his understanding of history. Webb and Wright, *James Stuart Archive 3*, 206.
- <sup>34</sup> *Ibutho*: singular noun: *ibutho*, pl. *amabutho*, a term used for an age-based 'regiment'.
- <sup>35</sup> 'Ndhlovu ka Timuni', Webb and Wright, *James Stuart Archive 3*, 200.
- <sup>36</sup> See 'Jantshi ka Nongila', in Colin de B. Webb and John B. Wright, eds, *The James Stuart Archive of Recorded Oral Evidence Relating to the History of the Zulu and Neighbouring Peoples, Volume 1* (Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press; Durban: Killie Campbell Africana Library, 1976), 190, 194, 197.
- <sup>37</sup> See Hamilton, *Terrific Majesty*, 62–64, 68. At the time of writing I do not have any further genealogical information about Nongila.
- <sup>38</sup> 'Jantshi ka Nongila', Webb and Wright, *James Stuart Archive 1*, 174; Madlala, 'The Role of Prince Thimuni kaMudli kaJama'.
- <sup>39</sup> 'Ndhlovu ka Timuni', Webb and Wright, *James Stuart Archive 3*, 207.
- <sup>40</sup> Jeff Guy, *The Maphumulo Uprising: War, Law and Ritual in the Zulu Rebellion* (Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2005), 45–47.
- <sup>41</sup> Guy, *The Maphumulo Uprising*, 134–135. The imbrication of Madikane Cele in *kholwa* affairs and in the world of chiefly politics offers a further example of the kinds of entanglements typical of this time. See Heather Hughes, 'Politics and Society in Inanda, Natal: The Qadi under Chief Mqhawe, c.1840–1906' (PhD diss., University of London, 1996) and Heather Hughes and Mwelela Cele, 'Regionalism and the Archival Record: The Case of the Qadi in the Colony of Natal', *International Journal of Regional and Local History* 8, no. 2 (2013): 79–93.

- <sup>42</sup> James Stuart, *u Baxoxele: Incwadi Yezindaba za Bantu ba kwa Zulu, na ba seNatala* (London: Longman, 1924), 59–80; John B. Wright, 'Socwatsha kaPhaphu, James Stuart, and Their Conversations on the Past, 1897–1922', *Kronos* 41 (2015): 142–165.
- <sup>43</sup> See John B. Wright, 'Thununu kaNonjija Gcabashe Visits James Stuart in the Big Smoke to Talk about History', *Natalia* 49 (2019): 1–12.
- <sup>44</sup> See Hlonipha Mokoena, "'The Black House', or How the Zulus Became Jews', *Journal of Southern African Studies* 44, no. 3 (2018): 401–411; Hamilton, *Terrific Majesty*, 62–71 and more recently Carolyn Hamilton and John Wright, 'Moving Beyond Ethnic Framing: Political Differentiation in the Chiefdoms of the KwaZulu-Natal Region before 1830', *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 43, no. 4 (2017): 663–679.
- <sup>45</sup> See discussion in Mokoena, *Fuze*, 49–54.
- <sup>46</sup> Mokoena, *Fuze*, 49–50.
- <sup>47</sup> Mokoena, *Fuze*, 42, 199.
- <sup>48</sup> Mokoena, *Fuze*, 217–235.

## REFERENCES

- Carton, Benedict, John Laband and Jabulani Sithole, eds. *Zulu Identities: Being Zulu, Past and Present*. Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2009.
- Cope, Nicholas. 'The Zulu Petit Bourgeoisie and Zulu Nationalism in the 1920s: Origins of Inkatha'. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 16, no. 3 (September 1990): 431–451.
- Eldredge, Elizabeth A. *The Creation of the Zulu Kingdom, 1815–1828: War, Shaka, and the Consolidation of Power*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Fuze, Magema M. *Abantu Abamnyama Lapha Bavela Ngakhona*. Pietermaritzburg: City Printing Works, 1922.
- Fuze, Magema M. 'A Visit to King Ketswayo'. *Macmillan's Magazine* (March 1878): 421–432.
- Gumede, William and Leslie Dikeni, eds. *The Poverty of Ideas: South African Democracy and the Retreat of Intellectuals*. Johannesburg: Jacana Media, 2009.
- Guy, Jeff. *The Maphumulo Uprising: War, Law and Ritual in the Zulu Rebellion*. Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2005.
- Guy, Jeff. *The View across the River: Harriette Colenso and the Zulu Struggle against Imperialism*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2002.
- Hamilton, Carolyn. *Terrific Majesty: The Powers of Shaka and the Limits of Historical Invention*. Cape Town: David Philip, 1998.
- Hamilton, Carolyn and Lesley Cowling. 'Rethinking Public Engagement'. In *Babel Unbound: Rage, Reason and Rethinking Public Life*, edited by Lesley Cowling and Carolyn Hamilton, 21–39. Johannesburg: Wits University Press, 2020.
- Hamilton, Carolyn and John Wright. 'Moving Beyond Ethnic Framing: Political Differentiation in the Chiefdoms of the KwaZulu-Natal Region before 1830'. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 43, no. 4 (2017): 663–679.
- Hughes, Heather. *The First President: A Life of John Dube*. Johannesburg: Jacana Media, 2011.
- Hughes, Heather. 'Politics and Society in Inanda, Natal: The Qadi under Chief Mqhawe, c.1840–1906'. PhD diss., University of London, 1996.
- Hughes, Heather and Mwelela Cele. 'Regionalism and the Archival Record: The Case of the Qadi in the Colony of Natal'. *International Journal of Regional and Local History* 8, no. 2 (2013): 79–93.

- Khumalo, Vukile. 'The Class of 1856 and the Politics of Cultural Production(s) in the Emergence of Ekukhanyeni, 1855–1910'. In *The Eye of the Storm: Bishop John William Colenso and the Crisis of Biblical Inspiration*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper, 207–241. Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Publications, 2003.
- La Hausse de Lalouvière, Paul. *Restless Identities: Signatures of Nationalism, Zulu Ethnicity and History in the Lives of Petros Lamula (c.1881–1948) and Lymon Maling (1889–c.1936)*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 2000.
- Madlala, Thembinkosi N. 'The Role of Prince Thimuni kaMudli kaJama in Zulu History with Special Reference to the Activities of his Sons, Ndlovu and Chakijana, and their Descendants, 1842–1980'. Master's thesis, University of Zululand, 1997.
- Marks, Shula. 'The Ambiguities of Dependence: John L. Dube of Natal'. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 1, no. 2 (1975): 162–180.
- Mokoena, Hlonipha. "'The Black House', or How the Zulus Became Jews". *Journal of Southern African Studies* 44, no. 3 (2018): 401–411.
- Mokoena, Hlonipha. *Magema Fuze: The Making of a Kholwa Intellectual*. Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2011.
- Ndletyana, Mcebisi, ed. *African Intellectuals in 19th and Early 20th Century South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC Press, 2008.
- Poyner, Jane, ed. *J.M. Coetzee and the Idea of the Public Intellectual*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2006.
- Stuart, James. *u Baxoxele: Incwadi Yezindaba za Bantu ba kwa Zulu, na ba seNatala*. London: Longman, 1924.
- Vale, Peter, Lawrence Hamilton and Estelle Prinsloo, eds. *Intellectual Traditions in South Africa: Ideas, Individuals and Institutions*. Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2014.
- Webb, Colin de B. and John B. Wright, eds. *The James Stuart Archive of Recorded Oral Evidence Relating to the History of the Zulu and Neighbouring Peoples, Volume 1*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press; Durban: Killie Campbell Africana Library, 1976.
- Webb, Colin de B. and John B. Wright, eds. *The James Stuart Archive of Recorded Oral Evidence Relating to the History of the Zulu and Neighbouring Peoples, Volume 3*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press; Durban: Killie Campbell Africana Library, 1982.
- Webb, Colin de B. and John B. Wright, eds. *A Zulu King Speaks: Statements Made by Cetshwayo kaMpande on the History and Customs of His People*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 1978.
- Wright, John B. 'Ndukwana kaMbengwana as an Interlocutor on the History of the Zulu Kingdom, 1897–1903'. *History in Africa* 38 (2011): 343–368.
- Wright, John B. 'Socwatsha kaPhaphu, James Stuart, and Their Conversations on the Past, 1897–1922'. *Kronos* 41 (2015): 142–165.
- Wright, John B. 'Thununu kaNonjiya Gcabashe Visits James Stuart in the Big Smoke to Talk about History'. *Natalia* 49 (2019): 1–12.

*Public Intellectuals in South Africa* illuminates and enriches our understanding of ... intellectualism in various spheres of life – from the arts to journalism, politics and the church. Equally commendable is that this book illustrates that orality has been just as impactful as written text. Orality captured public intellectualism in its original form: speaking out, directly to power! — MCEBISI NDLETYANA, Associate Professor of Politics, University of Johannesburg

South Africa, however you come at it, has in its whole narrative ... complexities about who we are as people, which surprise, shock and regularly inspire. This collection does that – in buckets full. I thought I knew South Africa, but reading about the individuals shared here, I realised how much more I have to learn about the country I live in.  
— CRAIN SOUDIEN, former CEO of the Human Sciences Research Council

This book offers critical insights into the role of the public intellectual at significant junctures in South Africa's colonial and apartheid past and its transition to democracy. Now, more than ever, an informed interrogation of the history of the public intellectual is essential reading. — ADAM HAUPT, Professor and Director of the Centre for Film & Media Studies, University of Cape Town

This book utilises the idea of public intellectualism as an interpretive prism and activist principle in order to enrich our understanding of South African intellectual life. The multidisciplinary essays explore historic concepts of public intellectualism by engaging with those who spoke out against the corruption of power, promoted a progressive politics that challenged the colonial project and its legacies, and encouraged a sustained dissensus with the political status quo. They offer fascinating accounts of the lives and work of public intellectuals who were writers, critics and activists across a range of contexts and disciplines, including Aggrey Klaaste, Elijah Makiwane, William Pretorius and Mewa Ramgobin, among others.

CHRIS BROODRYK is Chair of Drama, School of the Arts, University of Pretoria, where he is a senior lecturer in Drama and Film Studies and also teaches screenwriting and non-fiction film-making.

Available as an eBook

ISBN 978-1-77614-689-5



9 781776 146895

www.witspress.co.za



WITS UNIVERSITY PRESS